THEOLOGY

VOL. LIX OCTOBER, 1956 No. 436

Training Doves

WHEN in 1948 I was appointed to a canonry at Windsor, it seems to me now that I had given too little thought to what I was going to do with the large official residence in the Castle, which I was expected to occupy. Doubtless, if I had had a wife, it would have been otherwise. However, no sooner had I been installed than my colleague, the late Duncan Armytage, who was a pillar of C.A.C.T.M., asked whether I would be willing as an experiment to have some middle-aged men to live with me so that they might prepare for ordination under my supervision. I was told that they would be men of parts who would be capable of reading on their own and would not need to be spoon-fed. As I could think of no good reason for saying no, and as I was acquiring an uneasy conscience about living alone in so large a house, I agreed to make a start as soon as possible. It was understood that it would be for me to work out my own method of training.

Almost at once I began to receive inquiries from bishops about whether I had room for candidates whom they were sponsoring. Within a few months all the rooms I could make available were engaged, and they have been engaged ever since. In fact, I have usually been fully booked up for a year ahead, and have had regretfully to refuse many good candidates. At first I could take six at a time, but later I was able to make room for a seventh. It has been an essential feature of the course that the candidates should all live together with me and help one another. Once or twice I weakened and had one or two men living out, but it was obviously not the same thing and I have latterly resisted all pressure to accept more than seven men at a time.

It soon became desirable to have a convenient name for these middle-aged ordination candidates, preferably a monosyllable; so I started calling them "doves" after "Vaughan's doves"—the (young) men who were trained by C. J. Vaughan in the last century. (You must find out for yourself, dear reader, why Vaughan's doves were called "doves".) By a happy coincidence one of the last survivors of that notable company, the late Dr E. H. Fellowes, was living almost next door to me in Windsor Castle. The name "doves" immediately took on, and I will use it here.

This scheme has now been operating for nearly eight years and over forty doves have been ordained from my house, most of whom are now incumbents. I feel justified therefore in describing the method of training I have evolved. It has been well tested and variously improved in the light of experience, and its fruits are observable. I am convinced that doves are a most valuable addition to the Church's ministry, especially for work in country parishes.

There must be clergymen in cathedral closes and in large rectories who are better qualified than I have been to train doves. But many people have said that it would be useful if I published particulars of my methods. They may at least serve as a stimulus to others to do better.

First then, what sort of men have my doves been? (I do not see how I can avoid using the first person singular a good deal.) The age bracket has been 40 to 60 years of age, though I have occasionally transgressed it at one end or the other: but the average has probably been just about 50. The doves have all been approved for training either by a bishop or by C.A.C.T.M. or by both before I have accepted them. Most of them have been married, and I have made sure that the wives were entirely in sympathy with their husbands' decision to seek ordination. I have also given the wives some good advice when I have had the chance! The previous professions and experience of doves have been multifarious. There has always been more than one officer from the Regular Army: the Royal Navy, on the other hand, has come into action only during the last year. The Merchant Navy has been well represented. I have had two doctors, two journalists, two inspectors of taxes, several schoolmasters, one don, one bank manager, also civil servants, and men who have been engaged in industry, agriculture, commerce or administration at home or abroad. The first batch of doves all seemed to have been in India at some time or other, and I had to stop their conversation from becoming too Poona-esque! Doves have come to the idea of ordination in different ways: some had had thoughts of such a vocation when they were young; to others the idea had first occurred when by apparent chance the Church's urgent need for more clergy was brought to their notice in a newspaper or over the radio; a few had been lay readers for longer or shorter periods, but most have had no previous experience of that kind. All along I have been greatly impressed by the modesty and diffidence with which the doves embarked upon their training, by their readiness and eagerness to learn, and by their willingness to step down from the positions of authority which they had occupied in their previous careers and to start again at the bottom of the ladder.

Secondly, what has been the length of the course? We have had four terms in the year of nine weeks each, with a long week-end break in the middle of each term. I worked out a syllabus that is covered in five terms, i.e. in a year and a quarter. After every fifth term I have gone back to the beginning. In whatever term a dove has arrived, he has therefore been able to complete the course by staying for five terms. While it has been a disadvantage in some respects that each generation has not started in the same term, there has been ample compensation in the fact that there has always been an overlap so that a tradition has been constantly handed on and has not had to be recreated from scratch every sixth term. Experience has convinced me that five terms is as a rule the right length of course for this type of candidate. I do not see how they can be tolerably trained in a shorter time, except in cases where they have previously

had a good deal of indirect training; on the other hand, in five terms they imbibe as much theory as they can usefully absorb before putting it to the test of practice. If the course were to be extended, I should be in favour of having them back for a further term after they have been ordained two or three years.

Thirdly, what has been our daily routine? From Monday to Friday as follows: we all spend at least half an hour before breakfast in meditation and Bible-reading in St George's Chapel, where there is also a daily eucharist. We breakfast in silence. At 9.15 a.m. we attend mattins, which is sung on three days a week and said on the others. By 10 a.m. our rooms have been tidied and dusted by the domestic staff (we make our own beds), and the morning is then entirely free for private study, except for a short break at 11 a.m. and for one morning a week when I expound a book of the Bible for three-quarters of an hour before lunch. The afternoons are available for exercise, and there is scope for playing golf in the (private) home park. After tea there is evensong at 5 p.m., sung daily except on Wednesday. From 6 to 7.15 p.m. on three evenings a week I hold a "seminar" with the doves. One of them, who has been notified a week beforehand,[1] reads a paper of not more than fifteen minutes' duration on one of the subjects about which they have all been reading during the preceding days (for syllabus, see below). Then I ask them questions and they ask me questions, and I talk more than perhaps I should, and we discuss the subject, and nearly always find that the hour for dinner has arrived before we know where we are. My dog Zimri, who as a puppy at Hawarden was nursed by Professor Dodd and other eminent divines, has never missed a seminar at Windsor and is prepared to challenge any other dog in christendom to a trial of theological wit. (One of these evenings each week is devoted to a sermon-seminar which I will describe separately.) After dinner, the evening is free for further private study and for writing up notes on the day's work. Each dove makes for future reference his own collection of notes on the whole course with plenty of bibliographical data, and also acquires the habit of keeping a common-place book. At 10 p.m. after a cup of cocoa we say compline together. Each dove has his own bedroom-study: we take all meals together and wait on ourselves. I have been fortunate in having the co-operation of a devoted and exceedingly competent housekeeper who has kept the domestic routine running smoothly and punctually. Saturday, after breakfast, is a day-off and every dove is obliged to go away either to friends within reach or on an expedition to London or elsewhere: those whose families are near enough are able to get home on Friday night. This arrangement serves several good purposes. It affords welcome refreshment in the midst of hard labour, it forms the salutary habit of a weekly day-off, and it leaves me my house to myself once a week so that I can entertain other friends. On Sunday the doves

[1] To begin with, I made the mistake of assigning papers for the whole term at the beginning of each term, but I found each dove was tempted to concentrate on preparing his own next paper instead of on the reading required for the current week.

attend the morning services in St George's Chapel, and in the evening gain experience in taking services themselves and in preaching in churches around Windsor.

Fourthly, what is the syllabus we have followed? Obviously in fifteen months only a grounding can be had in the many things every clergyman ought to know. The doves have naturally been surprised by the wide range of studies in which I have expected them to engage: even when they have found it heavy-going, they have studied with extraordinary zest. I have not called upon them to memorize a lot of information, but have aimed at equipping them with knowledge about where the information they should have at their disposal can readily be found, and where they can read further about the many topics which we have been able only to open up. We take two principal subjects each term, and these are broken down into eight or nine sections for purposes of weekly reading and seminars. Every dove is provided with a reading list for the whole course, with the help of which he builds up a working parson's library. Some books are of course obligatory for all but, so far as possible, I encourage them to choose for themselves among a variety of books. (Needless to say, they all have to become subscribers to THEOLOGY!) The complete syllabus is as follows:

TERM A.

(i) *Bible: Old Testament.*

1. How is the Bible like, and unlike, other books? In what sense is it the word of God, and inspired?
2. Genesis 1–11: the origin of these chapters and their meaning for us to-day.
3. The history of the Hebrews from the call of Abraham to the return from the exile. Is there a Hebrew philosophy of history?
4. The law of Israel: its origin, development, and permanent value.
5. The message of the prophets of Israel for their time and ours.
6. The Psalms: their origin, uses, and interpretation by Christians.
7. The Wisdom literature (including Cant. and Eccles.).
8. The Maccabean revolt and apocalyptic literature.

(ii) *Christian Worship.*

1. The development of Christian worship till the end of the middle ages.
2. The English Prayer Books: their purpose, structure, and history.
3. Mattins and evensong.
4. The baptism services and the churching of women.
5. The catechism and confirmation.
6. The communion service.
7. The ordinal and the visitation of the sick.
8. The marriage and burial services.

TERM B.

(i) *Bible: New Testament.*

1. What is the Gospel? How was it good news (*a*) for Jews, (*b*) for Gentiles?
2. The synoptic problem, and the different characteristics of the synoptic gospels.
3. The Acts of the Apostles: how the Church spread from Jerusalem to Rome.
4. The Epistles of St Paul. Their classification, authenticity and characteristic doctrines.
5. The Epistle to the Hebrews. Its argument and permanent value. The use of the O.T. in the N.T.

6. The fourth gospel. Its date, authorship, historical character, and theological teaching.
7. The catholic epistles. Their date, authorship, and distinct teaching.
8. The Revelation of St John.

(ii) *Early Church History.*

1. The world into which Gospel and Church came. The Roman Empire. Hellenistic culture. Stoicism. The mystery religions. Judaism.
2. The belief and practice of the Church A.D. 100–150. Clement of Rome, Ignatius of Antioch, Polycarp, The Didache, Justin.
3. Early heresies and early fathers. Montanism, Gnosticism, Marcion, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen.
4. The development of the ministry. The origins of episcopacy and papacy. Cyprian. The place and work of women in the early Church.
5. Church and state from Nero to Constantine. The persecutions. Edict of Toleration.
6. Arianism. The Councils of Nicaea and Constantinople. Athanasius, Basil, the Gregorys, Eusebius of Caesarea.
7. Christological heresies. Apollinarianism, Nestorianism, Eutychianism. Council of Chalcedon. Cyril of Alexandria and Leo the Great.
8. The life and teaching of St Augustine of Hippo. Manichaeism, Donatism, Pelagianism. The City of God. Ambrose.

TERM C.

(i) *Christian Doctrine.*

1. The nature and sources of Christian doctrine. Scripture, tradition, reason. The place of the 39 Articles. (Arts 6, 7, and 8.)
2. The doctrine of God. The Holy Trinity. (Art. 1.)
3. The Incarnation and the Virgin Birth. (Art. 2.)
4. The Atonement. The various theories. (Art. 2.)
5. The Descent into Hell. The Resurrection, the Ascension, and the Judgment. (Art 3 and 4.)
6. The Holy Spirit. (Art. 5.)
7. The nature of man. Creation and fall. (Arts 9 and 15.)
8. Grace and free-will. (Arts 10 and 16.)
9. Justification, sanctification, and predestination. (Arts 11–14, 17, 18.)

(ii) *Church History.*

1. The Church in Britain up to the Norman Conquest. Aidan, Augustine, Wilfred, Theodore, Dunstan.
2. Church and state in the middle ages. The papacy and the investiture controversy. Gregory VII, Innocent III, Thomas à Becket.
3. Theology in the middle ages. Anselm, Aquinas, scholasticism, Bernard, and Abelard.
4. Monasticism from its origins. Benedict. The monastic orders in the middle ages and in England.
5. The Friars. Francis and Dominic.
6. Daily life in the medieval church. Worship, sacraments, mysticism. Mother Julian.
7. The grandeur and decay of medieval christendom. The background of the Reformation. Wyclif.

TERM D.

(i) *Christian Doctrine.*

1. What does the Bible (O.T. and N.T.) teach about the Church?
2. The marks of the Church: one, holy, catholic, apostolic. (Art. 19.)
3. The Church's authority in doctrine and discipline. (Arts 20, 21, and 34.)
4. The Church expectant and triumphant. Purgatory. Prayer for the dead. Invocation of saints. (Art. 22.)
5. National Churches: relations of Church and State. (Arts 24, 32, 33, 35, and 37.)

6. The ministry; apostolic succession; papal claims. (Arts 23 and 36.)
7. Sacraments in general. (Arts 25 and 26.)
8. Holy Baptism and Confirmation. (Art. 27.)
9. Holy Communion. (Arts 28 and 31.)

(ii) *Pastoralia*

1. Visiting.
2. The conduct of divine service and the care of the church fabric, furniture, etc.
3. The Church's organs of self-government.
4. Hearing confessions.
5. Parochial organizations and parish magazines.
6. Ministry to the sick, communion of the sick, spiritual healing.
7. The priest's household and daily routine.

TERM E.

(i) *Christian Ethics.*

1. The ethical teaching of the Bible. The permanent use of the Ten Commandments.
2. Marriage and the family. Birth control.
3. Divorce.
4. Christian responsibility in politics and the welfare state.
5. Christianity and international relations. The problem of war in the atomic age.
6. Gambling.
7. Christianity and punishment. The death penalty.
8. Christianity and medicine. Eugenics, artificial insemination, euthanasia.

(ii) *Church History.*

1. The Reformation on the Continent. Luther, Calvin, Zwingli.
2. The Reformation in England. Henry VIII to Elizabeth I.
3. The C. of E. in the 17th century.
4. The C. of E. in the 18th century.
5. The C. of E. in the 19th century.
6. The C. of E. 1900–1950.
7. The English Free Churches with a glance at contemporary "heresies".
8. The Anglican Communion: its missionary expansion.
9. The Ecumenical Movement.

At seminars my emphasis is as much as possible on the practical bearings for parish priests of whatever theological subject we are considering. In addition to the above, once or twice a term I have a "questions" seminar when I deal with written questions the doves ask me about matters not otherwise covered in the course. It goes without saying that there is constantly a great deal of less formal and not unvivacious questioning and discussion at meals and other times.

Sixthly, training in sermon preparation has had from the start a prominent place in this course, and incidentally has occasioned much fear and trembling in veterans of other professions! I have followed a method of which I got the idea from the College of Preachers in Washington (and I could wish it were followed throughout the Church of England with the ordained as well as the unordained). Once a week a sermon on a text or subject which I have prescribed is preached by a dove in the Rutland chapel in St George's: the congregation consists of the other doves and a few local residents or visiting wives. We afterwards adjourn to my house, and I call upon the other doves in turn to comment with brutal

frankness on the sermon they have heard. They will have taken notes for the purpose, and while they will praise what they deem praiseworthy they are expected to show keen powers of criticizing the preacher's delivery and style, the structure and doctrine of his sermon, his language and illustrations, and general effectiveness. Each dove after making his criticisms reads out the skeleton of a sermon which he has himself previously thought out on the same subject. Then the Dean of Windsor, who has often to our profit helped us with this exercise, and I myself speak our minds to the company with no less frankness. The admirable spirit with which often devastating criticisms have been made and received has reflected the greatest credit on everybody; moreover, it has been possible to observe as a result term by term progress both in each dove's own sermons and in his capacity for acutely and constructively criticizing other people's. The doves have found Rutland sermons a severe ordeal, but they would unite in testifying how much they have owed to it. I am sure the course would have been worth while for this weekly exercise alone.

Seventhly, the course, as so far outlined, has been supplemented in various ways. Each dove has been required to go to a retreat during one of his vacations. One of the lay clerks of St George's has provided most effective training in voice production and intoning. Officers of the C. of E. Moral Welfare Council have visited us and given guidance about preparing people for marriage, etc.; likewise a representative of the National Society about Sunday School work. Latterly the doves have got some experience of scouting through helping local troops on one evening a week. I have occasionally invited friends of my own to come and speak about matters of which they had special knowledge. But on the whole my object has been to keep as much time as possible free for reading and note-making and for informal discussion. I have never given any lectures, since I hold it is much better that students should read up and around their subjects at their own pace, and mark, learn and inwardly digest the material in their own way.

Lastly, what happens at the end of the course? In most cases, the bishop sponsoring a dove has proposed one or more titles to him six months or so prior to his being ready for ordination. But I have plenty of direct requests for dove-curates from incumbents themselves. It is not every incumbent who is ideally qualified to have a dove as a curate (or perhaps to have a curate at all), and there have been a few, but only a few, unhappy experiences at this stage. In lieu of the General Ordination Examination most doves have done either some essays for their bishops' examining chaplains or a deacons' paper. I have not allowed them to be daunted by this prospect, nor have they been. They have all come through with flying colours. After two or three years in a curacy, the normal pattern has been that a dove has been appointed to a benefice—usually, but not always, a country benefice. I have kept in touch with them all so far as possible by sending out quarterly "epistles to the doves" with, among other things, recommendations for reading, by personal

correspondence and visits, by a biennial reunion at Windsor, and by an annual inside of a week together at Dunford near Midhurst. They have been uniformly indulgent to the preoccupations of one who has had several other irons in the fire. There is no doubt whatever that these men, ordained in middle life and after a wide experience of the world, are very happy in the work to which they have now given themselves, and I have abundant evidence that they are much appreciated by their parishioners. I should add perhaps that they do not leave Windsor with starry-eyed notions about the present condition of the Church of England.

I am having myself to give up training doves at the end of this Michaelmas term, but I hope others will embark upon it. It is wonderfully rewarding in all sorts of ways, not least in the acquisition of many new and really close friends.

A. R. Vidler.

A Letter from North India

Although a number of things are happening in the Church in North India which well deserve comment, I shall confine this letter to recent developments in Prayer Book revision. The *Proposed Prayer Book* which was authorized by the Episcopal Synod of the Church of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon in 1951 has more than once been noticed in these pages.

An interesting feature about our latest revision is that it shows signs of a partial resolution of the familiar domestic tension within Anglicanism between evangelical and catholic. In one case at least this resolution is not a mere compromise, but is bringing forth something positive and constructive. It is not mere fancy to suppose that this has been conditioned by the underlying tension between East and West, of which the Ceylon Liturgy was the first important product in this Province.

The *Proposed Prayer Book* was published in English in January 1953, but only a few portions have so far appeared in the Indian languages. For this reason, since the great majority of congregations worship in their mother tongues, it has not yet made much impact upon most church people. Even for English-speaking congregations the word "Proposed" in the title, together with its cost (Rs. 4— though 6 shillings is cheap for 950 pages), has been sufficient to deter them from making use of it. Furthermore, little attempt has been made to "push" it—only one diocesan systematically expounded it in his monthly magazine—and many people first heard of it through the vigorous denunciations of a well-known figure who detected "Rome" on every other page!

The *Proposed Prayer Book* could not unfairly be described in general as a conservative revision on Western catholic lines, and contains very few Eastern features (apart from "A Liturgy for India", which continues to be ignored outside the Bombay diocese).

No one can have supposed that this Book was more than a first attempt to discover what is really needed by the Province. Various diocesan liturgical committees got to work on it in 1954, and sent in critical reports for consideration by the Episcopal Synod in January 1955. The Synod planned to make a new draft of a "basic" Prayer Book which could be presented to the General Council in January 1956 for "first concurrence". The chief characteristics of this draft, apart from numerous practical and literary improvements, were (*a*) a considerable reduction in length through the omission of the Appendices included in the *Proposed Prayer Book* as well as other matter,[1] and (*b*) a number of alterations and omissions asked for by critics who felt that the evangelical point of view had received insufficient consideration in the earlier revision. Such was the measure of agreement reached in 1955 that the Synod seems to have expected "first concurrence" to be readily given by the General Council this year, as the Book has to receive concurrence twice in substantially the same form before it can be fully authorized.

As it turned out, however, the General Council refused its concurrence, but in an ambiguous fashion. On the one hand, it appears that there has been some misreading of the Constitution, and that the Declaration which speaks of concurrence may not refer to the Prayer Book but only to the passing of Canons. On the other hand, some delegates said that they could never agree to the Prayer Book without further changes being made. They asked the Synod to remove (*a*) all occurrences of prayer for the departed, and (*b*) the permission for reservation for the sick. This came as a surprise after the apparent agreement of the previous year, when (*a*) all prayers for the departed (except, by an oversight, those in the Burial Service) were placed within brackets, making their use entirely optional, and (*b*) the rubric which permits reservation was expanded so as to prohibit any kind of extra-liturgical devotions, not to mention the fact that the "basic" Prayer Book will also contain the Black Rubric. The reason given for taking this strong line was that once the Prayer Book is authorized all ordinands will have to "assent" to it, and therefore the fact that both prayers for the departed and reservation for the sick are merely permissive would not sufficiently protect those who believe these practices to be wrong.

Despite the withholding of concurrence, the draft of the basic Book is to be printed and submitted to the diocesan councils; but it is not at all clear how it may eventually be given full authorization, even when agreement on its contents is reached.

I should like to mention three of the new features in the present draft.

(*a*) In the Tables and Rules of 1951 the South African Prayer Book was drawn upon for its clarification of the long-standing confusion between fasting and abstinence, but the traditional Western criterion of not eating meat appeared in the definition of both terms.

[1] Most of this is to be published after further consideration in a "supplementary book".

It was very properly pointed out that this was hardly realistic in countries where the great majority of the inhabitants are unable to afford a meat diet except on rare occasions, and very many are vegetarians by preference. When this was referred to a sub-committee of nationals from the different countries in this Province, they soon proposed new definitions which are practical and appropriate. Days of fasting are "days on which not more than one main meal is taken", and days of abstinence are "days of self-denial, to be observed by taking a smaller quantity of food than usual or by some other form of self-discipline". It now only seems strange that we have had to wait so long for this sensible solution.

(*b*) The Eucharistic Liturgy is the section where most alterations have been made, which reflects the fact that this part of the 1951 Book has been given the widest trial. This whole Part of the Prayer Book (which includes the modified 1951 rite, the 1662 rite, and the Propers) is now to be called "The Lord's Supper", with "The Holy Eucharist" and "The Holy Communion" as sub-titles. The only significance of this is to avoid any implied contrast between a "Eucharist" (1951) and a "Communion" (1662), and the two rites are now only distinguished by their dates.

Apart from the Canon, the most interesting changes in the rest of the 1951 rite are these. The Preparation (now called "A Devotion") is simplified by having a Confession and Absolution which are identical in wording with those used at Compline. The initial Our Father is omitted. The awkward bidding for non-Christian rulers, followed by versicle and response, which came before the Prayer for the Church, has been dropped. By making the Prayer a general intercession "for the whole Church of Christ, and for all men according to their needs", they can now be prayed for in the body of the Prayer. The brief prayers before and after the Litany form of the Intercession have also been found wanting, though the Litany itself is greatly appreciated; the new prayers are given in a footnote.[1] Proper Prefaces and Post-Communions (now called "Prayers before the Blessing") which proliferated in 1951 to the confusion of simple users of the book, are now reduced to those of the Festivals with Octave and Trinity Sunday; the remainder, after due consideration, will appear in the supplementary book. The Prayer of Humble Access, which in 1951 came after the *Agnus* and immediately before the Communion, now precedes the *Agnus* (so that this may be sung during the priest's communion) and is directed to be said by all together (cp. the C.S.I. Liturgy). The rubric after the *Gloria in Excelsis* allows its omission

[1] All things come of thee, and of thine own do we give unto thee, O Creator of the world, who art ever adored by the holy angels. We humbly beseech thee to accept at our hands these (alms and) oblations, which we present at thy holy Table, and with them the offering of ourselves to the service of thy divine majesty; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

Hasten, O Father, the coming of thy kingdom; and grant that we and all thy servants, being quickened together in the eternal fellowship of thy Holy Spirit, may behold thy Son at his coming again in glorious Majesty, even Jesus Christ, our only Mediator and Advocate.

Answer. Amen; come, Lord Jesus.

"on any day, not being a Sunday or Greater Festival" except during Eastertide, thus rescinding the permission given in 1951 to omit it on Sundays in Advent and Lent.

It will be seen that the direction of most of these charges, as of others not here specified, is towards simplification; and even those who regret some of them will acknowledge that the needs of the average worshipper call for some such self-denial.

The changes in the Prayer of Consecration have already been set out by Canon Sansbury in the July number of THEOLOGY, where he discussed them from the point of view of a liturgist. To one who was present at the discussions of the Synod it appeared that though the 1951 revision followed more or less the conventional 1549 pattern, that of 1955[1] was intended to break away in an Eastern direction. (Canon Sansbury's comments make one wonder how far this has been done successfully.) In 1951 the epiclesis was taken as a prayer that we may communicate aright; but it was thought that the 1955 form would have a consecratory significance, and that this would be brought out by the congregation's repeated *Amen* both to the Words of Institution and to the epiclesis. If this is really so, it involves an abandonment of the traditional Anglican connexion of the moment of consecration with the Words of Institution. Certainly some who use the 1955 form have taken the view that the elevations at the Words of Institution are no longer appropriate, and that the only natural place with the new Prayer is at the doxology. Although the rubric on a second consecration has not been altered from its 1951 form in ordering the use of the Words of Institution alone to be used, this is only because the Synod has not yet had time for a thorough consideration of the matter, and it is recognized that it is probably incompatible with the intention of the 1955 Prayer.

In 1955 the anamnesis was rewritten to meet some liturgical criticisms of the 1951 form, but rather surprisingly the last Synod (1956) returned to the earlier form which had been discarded as unsatisfactory. The only reason for this was that the redrafting contained the phrase "offering . . . these thy holy gifts as the memorial which he hath commanded us to make" and it would not be easy to supply a reference for this commandment, yet it seems somehow to have escaped notice that the same phrase occurs in both versions of the anamnesis. This is one section where clearly a final formulation has not yet been reached, and Canon Sansbury is certainly correct in questioning whether this liturgy as a whole has reached its definitive form.

(*c*) One completely novel section will appear in the next draft of the Prayer Book under the heading "The Ministry of Reconciliation", which can be claimed as the fruitful resolution of an old tension. The *Proposed Prayer Book* included among the Occasional Offices a "Form of Confession and Absolution", which was derived from the South African Prayer Book. This was naturally a stumbling-block to those who could not accept sacramental confession as a

[1] 1955 is the date of this Indian Order, not 1954 as Canon Sansbury says.

regular ministry of the Church. It seemed, therefore, that there could be no conscientious agreement upon this section and that it would have to be relegated to the "supplementary book", where it would never come to the notice of the ordinary member of the Church.

However, the Synod of 1955 did not take the view that this was the only way out of the difficulty, but took into consideration the pastoral need for clear and practical teaching on repentance and forgiveness. The defect of our Prayer Book is not that it does not contain such teaching, but that it is scattered and virtually inaccessible to those many who do not know their Prayer Book well. It was therefore proposed to draft a new section which would both gather up the essential teaching on this subject and also set out the means of reconciliation which are available in the Church, balancing sacramental confession with non-sacramental; and the proposal was found to be widely acceptable. As drafted, the Ministry of Reconciliation contains the following parts:

1. *A Preface* with paragraphs on the need for repentance and forgiveness especially in preparation for Communion, on the examination of conscience, on the requirements for true penitence, and on the assurance of God's forgiveness.

2. *Forms for public use.*—(*a*) A revised version of the Commination Service, and (*b*) a Renewal of Baptismal Vows.

3. *Forms for private use.*—(*a*) A form of confession which may be used alone or after taking counsel with a fellow-Christian, and (*b*) a form of Confession and Absolution in the presence of a priest.

The draft has not yet been printed, and until it is tried out its chance of being finally accepted in our Prayer Book cannot be estimated. It could be very valuable, not only in the preparation of Confirmation candidates, but also as a continual reminder of the central place of reconciliation in the life of the Church. It could also show that the different schools of thought in our Church can do better than merely agree to differ. In this case at least the different emphases should be complementary. Too often those who lay emphasis upon the Sacrament of Penance hesitate to recognize the part which faithful lay folk can play in ministering the gospel of reconciliation, as if one excluded the other. Yet in the Eastern Orthodox Church both forms of the ministry are used and honoured, and the extra-hierarchical position of the Russian *staretz* is well known. A similar development in this Province would also be very much in keeping with our national backgrounds.

With the approach of Church Union in North India, Pakistan and Ceylon these Prayer Book questions gain an added importance. The "Anglican contribution" is of the greatest interest to all who hope to enter the Union, but its effectiveness will be very largely bound up with the quality of our Prayer Book, and the extent to which our people know, use and are formed by it.

J. D. M. Stuart.

The Doctrine of Intention

THE traditional test of the validity of a Sacrament—is there a right form, the right matter, the right minister and the right intention?—is well known, but any clear treatment of what is and what is not required for a right intention is not readily available to the ordinary man. There is indeed an urgent need for a short scholarly book on the subject,[1] with adequate references and full discussion of any debatable points; but in the meanwhile, until such book is produced, as the subject is one which is in people's minds and has caused considerable perplexity, it is desirable that an attempt should be made to state clearly what the doctrine is upon which recent judgments have been based.

It would be best to consider the doctrine first in relation to a sacrament concerning which this question has not been a matter of recent controversy. Given a validly ordained Catholic priest using the right form and the right matter, what would constitute a defective intention that would invalidate a Mass said by him? First, it would invalidate the Mass if he announced to the congregation beforehand that he was not intending to celebrate the sacred mysteries. One can, for example, imagine a case in which a priest, seeking to instruct deacons about to be ordained, might go through the entire rite with the proper elements merely as a demonstration of how Mass should be celebrated. There would here be no intention to do what the Church does and there would be no Mass.

Secondly, suppose a priest took part in a demonstration of how a Mass was celebrated in the 2nd century and the form used, though not in contemporary use, was such that used with a valid intention it would have constituted a valid Mass, then as the intention would be clearly not to celebrate the sacred mysteries for the purpose for which our Lord instituted the sacrament, but only to demonstrate how they were once celebrated, for the purposes of an archeological demonstration, it would not be a valid Mass.

It is to be noted that vague or erroneous beliefs concerning the blessed sacrament on the part of the celebrant do not constitute an invalid intention, otherwise, as we cannot tell what goes on within another man's mind, we could never be sure that any Mass was validly celebrated. Nor, indeed, would such vague or erroneous beliefs invalidate the sacrament even if the minister of it had given public expression beforehand to the vagueness or error of his beliefs, for this would demand that the entire congregation at each Mass should first know what views the celebrant had already expressed, lest some fell short of sacramental orthodoxy, and that they should also be adequately trained to detect an error in teaching even if it were rather an obscure mistake.

Further, if a priest lost his faith and wrote and signed a document

[1] *The Doctrine of Intention* (1924) by R. Ll. Langford-James is not now readily accessible. *Anglican Orders and Defect of Intention*, by Francis Clark, S.J., appeared after this article had been written.

utterly repudiating any intention of performing his sacred functions, filed this document secretly in his library, but continued, perhaps for financial reasons, to say Mass, blasphemous and wicked as his action would be, the Mass would still not be invalidated by defect of intention. Were it otherwise, the faithful could again never be certain whether a Mass were a valid Mass or whether it was invalidated by a secret repudiation of intention by the celebrant.

The theological reason why it is "the public" and not "the private" intention of the celebrant that is decisive, is that the sacrament is always the sacrament of Christ in his Body the Church, and so long as the priest continues to perform his priestly functions within the Church he does what the Church does, in so doing, unless he specifically declares openly, either that he is not doing so, or that he is doing something different. This is indeed not merely a question of theology but of common sense and the plain meaning of the word intention. In the case of a sacrament, however, the public repudiation of an intention to celebrate it actually changes the subsequent action. As a valid intention is necessary for a valid sacrament, where a public repudiation of intention to celebrate is made at the time, the subsequent performance of the action is not in fact a celebration of the sacrament.

It must also be clearly understood that the Doctrine of Intention is exclusively concerned with the intention of the celebrant. The question of the intention of any body or group to which he adheres only gives an indication of what the celebrant's intention is. As it is his public intention that is decisive as to whether he is or is not doing what the Church does, his public adherence to some group or body may be the means of defining what his intention is. Another example may serve to illustrate. Suppose an Orthodox priest lost his faith, repudiated his ministry, joined the Communist Party and in one of the churches that were converted into godless museums, celebrated the Orthodox liturgy to demonstrate to the Union of Militant Godless "the superstitious practices of the Church" in order that they might better know how to attack and ridicule them, the fact that he had abandoned the Church and entered an atheistic body would be a sufficient indication of his lack of intention to do what the Church does.

Much more difficult is the case when a priest enters an heretical sect, or some body, which while having some of the marks of membership of the Catholic Church, is yet clearly defective in others.

It is important at this point not to get entangled with the deceptive concept of "the intention of *a* Church". The Bible and Catholic theology know of but one Church, and whenever the notion of a multiplicity of Churches is allowed a footing in theological considerations the result is always muddled thinking and false conclusions. In the doctrine of intention we remain exclusively concerned with the intention of the individual celebrant, but as it is his public intention we are concerned with, his public adherence to a body whose opinions are known may be relevant evidence.

If a priest were to be converted to an heretical sect it is indeed

easy to think of circumstances in which his celebration of the Holy Communion would be invalid, either through a defective form or through a failure to use the right matter (e.g. in the case of some prohibitionist sects which refuse to use wine), but it is almost impossible to visualize the circumstances in which a priest who thus entered an heretical sect could invalidate a celebration of the Holy Communion through an invalid intention simply by reason of his joining the sect, if the sect were in any sense Christian at all and observed Holy Communion in some form. In so far as the sect sought to obey our Lord's command to "do this in remembrance of me" the general intention to fulfil that command would be an intention to do what the Church does, and such we would have to assume was the intention of the ex-Catholic priest. Vague, inadequate or erroneous sacramental teaching by the sect would no more invalidate the sacrament than vague, inadequate or erroneous sacramental teaching by an individual priest who had joined no sect would invalidate it. The difference between the two is not that one would be valid and the other not, but that the faithful could not partake at the former without condoning heresy and schism. It is to be noted, therefore, that the recognition of the validity of a sacrament does not by any means necessarily carry with it any inevitable measure of "Church relations".

Another point which sometimes causes confusion is the so-called "intention of the rite". In the strict sense, only a person can intend anything, a rite not being a person cannot intend to do or not to do anything, but again the words of a rite are of course evidence of what the celebrant intends.

Those sacraments which confer a status, such as Baptism and Holy Orders, require some further consideration. In regard to Holy Baptism, doubt as to whether the right form and matter has been used not infrequently make conditional Baptism necessary, but suspected defect of intention is in practice almost unknown as a cause necessitating conditional Baptism, despite the fact that a layman may be the minister of the sacrament; though clearly many of the lay people who perform the rite within the communion of the Catholic Church, and many others who perform the rite outside it, may hold inadequate or even heretical views on Baptism. The fact that they have a general intention to do what the Church does in response to the dominical command is sufficient guarantee of validity, provided the form and matter of the sacrament are faithfully observed.[1]

In normal circumstances the occasions upon which any question could arise in regard to the intention at a Consecration or Ordination, where the form, matter and minister are adequate, are very rare, but in recent Church affairs no less than three separate cases have arisen in which the question is involved.

First, it has been alleged that the so-called "secret protest" at the first post-Reformation consecration in Sweden creates a doubt

[1] It is perhaps worth remarking that even an unbaptized Jew has been held capable of a sufficient intention to perform a valid Baptism.

whether the consecration was not invalid by defect of intention. But, as we have seen, no secret protest, even if it were a specific denial of an intention to consecrate, could affect the validity of the rite. No one who has any understanding of the doctrine of intention could possibly imagine that the discovery of a secret document which lay unknown for hundreds of years after the event could possibly invalidate the rite. The possibility of other such documents, as yet unknown, existing in other cases would throw the validity of every consecration and ordination in Christian history into doubt. (In passing, we may mention that a Roman Catholic scholar after exhaustive study of this case reached the conclusion that there was no intention not to consecrate nor any lack of intention to consecrate in the secret document concerned.)

The second case is one which we may hope may never become actual. It has been suggested that a reunion between episcopal and non-episcopal bodies might be inaugurated by a service of "mutual commissioning", but that this would not involve the ordination of those not previously episcopally ordained. This it seems would clearly be a specific public denial of an intention to do what the Church does. Even if the minister, form and matter of such a rite were to be judged adequate if accompanied by a valid intention, this clear repudiation of an intention to ordain or consecrate would make the rite wholly invalid. Any non-episcopally ordained minister who had undergone it who later desired to become a bishop, priest or deacon would require to be consecrated or ordained anew. There would not even be sufficient doubt as to the invalidity of the rite to justify, still less to necessitate, the Orders only being conferred conditionally.

The third and most complicated case is that of the consecrations and ordinations in the Church of South India. It is clear that in this case no intention simply not to consecrate or ordain can be alleged, but the question has been raised whether the existence, alongside those episcopally ordained, of other ministers not so ordained, who are permitted to exercise the same functions within the C.S.I., does not at least put the question of a valid intention in doubt. It is to be noted that no such question can arise in regard to consecrations, as none but those episcopally consecrated by bishops in the apostolic succession are accepted as bishops in the C.S.I. The question arises only in regard to presbyters and deacons. Before the C.S.I. was inaugurated this was a very real issue, however, in regard to both consecrations and ordinations, for the fact that the Basis of Union and the proposed constitution of the C.S.I. permitted it to be held either that episcopacy was essential, or that it was not essential, created the real possibility that when the first consecrations and ordinations took place the celebrants might intend to do something different from what the Church does. It might have been, for instance, that the first consecrations of bishops would have been accompanied by a declaration that they were merely being given a jurisdiction they did not previously possess and that there was no intention to convey to them an Order. Lest it be thought that this was a purely fantastic idea, it should be remembered that some Presbyterian ministers claim that

they are bishops and therefore the rite in C.S.I. by which an ex-Presbyterian minister was given the title of bishop, might have been accompanied by a specific repudiation of any intention to make him anything different from what he was before.

Further, as non-episcopally ordained ministers were to be allowed to continue to function in the C.S.I., it might have been that the ordination of presbyters in C.S.I. would have been accompanied by a specific repudiation of an intention to make them anything different from their non-episcopally ordained brethren. Indeed, it might have been not unreasonably argued that such repudiations would have been the logical outcome of the woolly and inadequate ideas in the C.S.I. constitution.

It was, therefore, not unreasonable for Catholic theologians, before the inauguration of the C.S.I., to say that there was no adequate evidence on which to judge whether consecrations and ordinations in the C.S.I. would be valid or not, but in the event, at the inauguration of the C.S.I., the first consecrations were accompanied by no such repudiation. Neither the celebrants nor those they consecrated had any doubt whatever that they were making those consecrated something different from what they were before and that they were making them bishops in the historic episcopate. From the text of the rite, from the statements in the Constitution and from the statements of the celebrants themselves, taken together, there is no ground whatever to doubt their intention to do what the Church does.

This does not in any way mean that it is claimed, or could be claimed, that their teaching about the ministry was, or is, orthodox catholic teaching. The fact that the ex-Anglican bishops who took part in the consecrations had themselves announced previously their readiness to receive the Holy Communion from ministers not episcopally ordained, was indeed a major cause for the fear that their action, when it took place, would be accompanied by an invalid intention; but, illogical as it may seem to some, they produced no evidence of any such defect of intention, and we need to be quite clear that an illogical mind is not the same thing as an invalid intention.

A few years after the inauguration one Province of the Anglican communion felt that the evidence was already adequate that this original valid intention was a persistent feature of the life of the C.S.I. so as to enable it to judge their consecrations and ordinations to be valid, but in the Provinces of Canterbury and York it was decided to postpone any judgment on this issue for five years in order to be entirely certain that the intention did persist and that no repudiation of it was attached to any rite such as would lead to a decision that the celebrant's intention was invalid.

No Anglican scholar of repute, even among those most critical of the C.S.I., has felt that it was possible to impugn the validity of the consecrations and ordinations in the C.S.I. on the grounds of a lack of intention. It needs, however, to be clearly realized that this question of the doctrine of intention is a very limited and precise one. Far from it being easy for a sacrament to be invalidated by lack of intention, it is in fact most rare for this to be the case.

A major cause of confusion has been the fact that many people have imagined that the only real issue in reunion discussions is the question of the ministry and whether or not it is valid. This is not and never has been the case and, as will be seen from the foregoing discussion, the recognition of orders as being technically valid still leaves untouched questions of supreme importance in regard to reunion. It must on no account be imagined that merely because Orders are recognized as valid because there is a right form, the right matter, the right minister and the right intention that this means that reunion is just round the corner without there being any other issues to discuss. It will be clear that it is perfectly possible to have a valid intention at ordinations and consecrations with an entirely false or inadequate doctrine of the ministry, and not until such erroneous or inadequate teaching were corrected could there be any real hope of progress towards Christian unity.

It is perhaps worth concluding this brief study of the doctrine of intention with a final example to illustrate the importance of understanding it correctly.

Many of those who, through inadequate knowledge, have attacked the validity of consecrations and ordinations in the C.S.I. on grounds of a deficient intention, have based this attack on the fact that it is permissible in the C.S.I. to believe that episcopal ordination is either essential or not essential. Few of those who have used this argument would class themselves as anti-Roman Protestants. It is to be imagined, therefore, that a deeper knowledge of Roman Catholicism might cause them to hesitate to use this erroneous argument which challenges the validity of all consecrations and ordinations in the Roman communion. Not all Roman theologians deny the theological necessity of episcopal consecration and ordination, but the belief that the priesthood has the capacity to perform all the functions of the episcopate is widely held and has not been officially condemned. This "Roman Presbyterianism" is of course tempered and qualified by a stress on the importance of authority and jurisdiction, yet inasmuch as those Roman Catholic theologians who hold this view believe that were the Pope to authorize a priest to consecrate or ordain, the sacraments would be valid, it is clear that the opinion which is alleged as evidence for attributing a lack of a valid intention in the C.S.I. is present also in the Church of Rome. One may deplore what one believes to be inadequate views on the doctrine of the ministry wherever they are to be found—in the C.S.I., the Church of Rome or the Church of England—but it is precarious to allege an inadequate intention on the grounds of this inadequate belief in any of these bodies.

The relation of the doctrine of intention to Anglican Orders has been deliberately excluded from this article, as the matter has been adequately dealt with elsewhere. Those who wish to pursue this aspect of the matter are referred to *The Question of Anglican Orders* by Dom Gregory Dix, O.S.B.

Michael Bruce.

A Note on the Dome of the Rock[1]

LET us begin by considering briefly the rather striking recurrences of the "rock" symbol in the Old Testament scriptures and in the Jewish liturgy. Quite apart from the tendency in the latter to address Yahweh as "Our Rock", a glance at any concordance will show that "the Rock" is one of the most familiar Old Testament epithets for Deity.

Among passages in which it occurs may be quoted Deut. 32. 4, "The Rock, his way is perfect" (R.V. uses the capital letter), 32. 18, Of the Rock that begat thee thou art mindful, with which we may compare Shemoneh 'Esreh 18, "The Rock of our lives, and the Shield of our salvation art thou from generation to generation." It is true that the English word in this, as in most subsequent passages, translates the Hebrew צוּר, not אֶבֶן, but both these words could be used to denote natural as distinct from graven stone.

In the Psalms the epithet צוּר is very commonly applied to God (Luther's Ein' Feste Burg has its origin in the Psalms).

We may instance:

Psalm 18. 2 Yahweh is my Rock: my God, my strong Rock.
18. 31 who is a Rock except our God.
18. 46 blessed be my Rock.
27. 5 In the covert of his tabernacle shall he hide me, and lift me upon a rock of stone.
28. 1 My Rock, be not thou deaf unto me.
31. 3 be thou to me a strong Rock.
61. 3 lead me to the Rock that is higher than I.
62. 6 He only is my Rock and my salvation.
62. 7 the Rock of my might.
71. 2 Be thou my strong Rock and house of defence, for thou art my Rock and my fortress.
95. 1 let us make a joyful noise unto the Rock of our salvation.
144. 1 Blessed be Yahweh my Rock.

We may compare with the above the words in the chanukah[2] hymn מָעוֹז צוּר, and in the Chanukah prayer צוּר תיינו, also the verse in the hymn Adon Olam צוּר חֶבְלִי בְּעֵת צָרָה

The epithet Rock is entirely absent from Psalm 119, which may indicate that the circle which produced that long Psalm did not approve of it.

It will naturally be said: "Yes, but 'the Rock' is only used metaphorically, and it is an epithet which in a country like Palestine is an obvious one, the significance of which is easily grasped." This may be granted, and yet one cannot help feeling that such metaphorical

[1] The substance of a short paper read at the International Congress for the Study of the History of Religions, Rome, April 1955.

[2] This spelling is adopted from the small Jewish Prayer Book issued in 1916. One might have expected the spelling with 2 Ks.

usage must have sprung originally out of something more primitive, which was also concrete, and that the original Eben Shetiyah may have even been a Jebusite megalith (venerated long before the Hebrews came to occupy Jerusalem) into a hole in which blood-libations were poured in prehistoric times.

The pilgrim to Jerusalem is usually told, when he visits the Temple area, (1) that the Dome of the Rock covers the stone slab which was the base of the great Altar of Sacrifice in the Jewish Temple; (2) that the *debir* or Holy of Holies, which stood to the north of it, contained nothing. [(1) occurs in many guide-books; (2) occurs in Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, art. "Temple".]

I wish to suggest that both these statements need reconsideration, and that the sacred slab within the Dome of the Rock constitutes probably the remaining fragment of what was the central feature of the *debir*, which thus enshrined a focus of devotion as concrete and visible as the *omphalos* in the Temple of Aphrodite at Paphos. This may seem shocking to those who think of the second commandment as prohibiting the cultus of any concrete symbol. Doubtless by the 1st century A.D. Judaism had long passed beyond the stage when such a symbol could be regarded as the focus of worship. But what the commandment forbids is the making of any likeness of anything, carven or graven, not the reverencing of a natural symbol or the saluting of an emblem. Anyone who has seen an orthodox synagogue congregation in Jerusalem at the moment when the *aron*[1] is opened and the scroll of the Torah is exposed to view can have no hesitation in acknowledging that the influence of a concrete symbol as a focus of devotion is never far away.

Now, what reasons may be adduced for believing that the great slab inside the Dome of the Rock was originally within the *debir*, and was not, as usually stated, the remains of the Altar of Sacrifice?

Let us consider the circumstances which led to the erection of the Dome. It was never the principal Masjid. The El Aksa mosque holds that position. It was built partly as a local rival to the Ka'aba at Mecca, but primarily to enshrine the great slab of rock which lies at its centre and which the Moslems knew to be a sacred object to the Jews. The Moslems, in fact, erected the Dome for the same purpose as the sanctuary of the Ka'aba at Mecca, which encloses the Black Stone. The Black Stone was not an altar of sacrifice, but a sacred symbol of some Arabian divinity. It may have had libations poured over it or before it, but it was no more an actual altar than the great stone which stands outside the west door of the church of Maentwrog in Wales. Maen-Turog means "stone of Turog", and Turog is a Celtic god or deified hero. The stone in this case was the visible symbol of Turog's presence, just in the same way that a great stone outside a Naga village in Assam may be the visible symbol of the presence of the spirit of some departed chieftain.

Now, whatever Christians in the period before the Moslem capture of Jerusalem may have believed about the great slab which is now

[1] The name for the casket or tabernacle containing the sacred scrolls of the Torah.

enshrined within the Dome of the Rock, the Moslems always thought of it as something other than an altar of sacrifice. It was, to them, the rock on which the world was built, and the rock from which Mohammed became air-borne when his supernatural steed, Al-Borak, took him up on a visit to heaven. It is improbable, to say the least, that Moslems should have built a sanctuary to contain what was nothing more than a derelict altar of blood-sacrifice. What they sought to enclose was evidently a much more sacred and supernatural symbol, which by tradition had always been a venerable focus of devotion.

The rock had previously been inside a Crusader church. Surely Christians could hardly have wished to fence in a Jewish altar of sacrifice. It would seem that even to Christians there must have been some mysterious motive in wishing to enclose one particular piece of the natural rock upon which Jerusalem is built. Edersheim and other scholars familiar with the traditions of the Jewish Temple say that the *debir* or Holy or Holies, though containing no furniture or statuary, enshrined a piece of natural rock called the Eben Shetiyah or Foundation Stone, which, according to report, covered the mouth of Sheol, *and upon which the world was founded.* It would seem, then, that Moslems simply continued the Jewish tradition (which can hardly have been unknown or unimportant to the Christians as well). Under the slab is a cavern, and the Great Sheyk of the Haram es Sherif told me, during my visit in 1952, that it was believed that here David and Solomon had prayed. It would seem rather peculiar to pray *underneath* an altar of blood-sacrifice—unless, of course, there had been in early times a kind of *taurobolium* ceremony connected with it, which seems unlikely. It appeared to me, when I saw it, much more probably that this prayer cavern was connected with the rock slab which existed in the *debir.*

The objection to the theory which I have put forward is the obvious one, namely that the size of the *debir* is known to us from passages in Scripture and in Josephus, and that its ground dimensions were such that the present slab, whether or not an altar of sacrifice, could not possibly have been contained within it. There is, however, an equally obvious answer to this objection, namely that the rock is not now of the same shape as it was in antiquity. As it exists to-day, it has a flat and rather sloping and uneven surface. But it is recorded that from the earliest years of Christian pilgrimage pieces of it were sliced or broken off by pilgrims, and a photograph taken vertically in recent times shows its surface to be scored with marks showing signs of the removal of souvenirs. It is quite reasonable to suppose, therefore, that in its original form it was more in the shape of a rude monolith, like Jacob's pillar, with a flat surround; and in this case the *debir* could perfectly well have stood on the flat part, with the sacred aniconic object or megalith sticking up in the middle. The hole in the slab which is usually indicated as the outlet through which the blood of the sacrifices drained away is not a very convincing drain for this purpose, seeing that if the slab itself had really been the altar of sacrifice, at the time when the animals were being slaughtered the whole of its surface would have been

dripping with blood, which would have poured down on to the surrounding floor. The hole itself is, in fact, much more like the familiar holes in stones with which the prehistorian is familiar, and into which blood-libations were poured in propitiation of chthonic deities.

If my plea is accepted, then the traditional site of the great Altar of Sacrifice must be abandoned for one a little further south on the Temple area, and the rock of the *debir* must be identified with the outcrop enclosed within the Dome of the Rock, and regarded as the original concrete symbolic object to which all the references in Scripture and liturgy point back, an extremely ancient and pre-Hebraic focus of devotion, which the Hebrews took over when they conquered the Jebusite citadel and sanctuary.

I suppose that there may be some hesitation about accepting the antiquity of the site, seeing that the Jebusite fortress is said to have been on *Ophel*, south of the Temple area, whereas Solomon is said to have set up his altar on or close to the "threshing-floor of Araunah the Jebusite"; but here again we have an admission of a Jebusite being already in occupation, and if the altar was on the threshing-floor, could not the *debir* have been established on the place occupied by Araunah's tutelary deity, which thus became appropriated to the worship of Yahweh, just as sacred pagan sites have come to be occupied by Christian churches?

A. C. Bouquet.

Studies in Texts

A PARAPHRASE OF ISAIAH 10. 1–19

1–4.

There is trouble coming to those who get their employees to do what is wrong and to those who "get round" regulations in such a way that people who have no "pull" are not treated like those with influence, or so that people who are not "up" in the regulations come off second best. What will you do in the day that God intervenes in your life, and you fall ill, or your business fails? Where will you run to for help then? What use are all your worldly goods if your health fails? When men leave God out of account they live like prisoners of war; they don't know anything about "Christian freedom"; rather they are slaves to their sinful lusts—and the wages of sin is death. The wrath of God is set against human sin. Remember, *God's arm is stretched out over Britain still!*

The Great Empire of the East

5–19.

"Oh, you great Empire of the East, I am going to make use of you in my wrath, as if you were a stick in my hand, to beat all hypocritical nations; I am going to use you as my instrument to carry war and destruction into the lands whose people have incurred my anger. (Of course, the big Power of the East doesn't know that he is my instrument; all he knows is that he is planning for world dominion.)"

What the latter says is: "My aim is to make all neighbouring states into my satellites, so that country X will be in the position of country A, which already does exactly as it is told, and country Y will do what it is told, just like country B, and country Z like country C. The peoples of the world have all kinds of religions and ideologies. But they don't need to think they can take refuge in them. I, the mighty power of the East, am going to impose *my* ideology upon them, even in lands which have a Christian tradition." What, then, will God say to that? "After I have made use of this great power", says God, "in judgment upon Christendom, then I will punish that insolent and godless Eastern power. Do you know what he says? He actually declares that he has enlarged his empire by his own initiative and diplomacy, and by means of his tanks and airplanes. 'Look at me', he says, 'I have altered frontiers of nations at will, I have sucked their economy into the orbit of my own, I have instituted a totalitarian regime in land after land, because I am the great nation of the earth. It has been as easy as bird-nesting; I have just helped myself to their natural resources. In fact, they are all like a lot of scared crows, those little nations. They flap their wings when they see me coming, they open their mouths wide like baby birds in the nest and squeak with terror.' But what about *my* point of view on all this?" God goes on to say. "Who is it that cuts down a tree? Is it the axe in a man's hand or is it the man who is wielding the axe? Can the axe boast, then, and say, 'Look, I cut down that tree myself!'? And the same with a saw. Is it not the man who first made the saw and then who handles it who is the one that cuts the wood? You can say the same about any of the tools a man uses. Well, then, that is *my* position with regard to the great power of the East," says God. That is to say, in some way or another God will judge them; it may be an economic collapse, it may be by internal rebellion. Then it will be that he who is the Light of Christendom will be more of a Fire than a Light, and he who is the Holy One will actually become a Flame that will burn up the weeds and the tares in one day. All his boasted civilization, his scientific discoveries and his secular philosophy of life alike will be destroyed as if in a great forest fire. And he, whom lots of people throughout the world looked upon as a kind of standard-bearer of a new philosophy of the state, will fall to the ground with a crash. All that will be left of his civilization will be so little that a child at school could learn all there is to know about it.

G. A. F. Knight.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. J. D. M. Stuart is a member of the Cambridge Brotherhood of the Ascension at Delhi.

The Rev. Michael Bruce is Rector of Chiddingfold.

Dr Bouquet is the author of *Comparative Religion*, etc.

The Rev. G. A. F. Knight is Professor of Old Testament Studies, Knox College, University of Otago, Dunedin, N.Z.

CORRESPONDENCE

ARCHBISHOP DAVIDSON AND THE CHURCH

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

From the circumstances of our lives, Archdeacon Mason and I are bound to approach the question of Randall Davidson's life and thought from rather different aspects—he as one who was brought up under the personal influence of the archbishop, I as one who never even saw him and must base my judgment on his biography and published works. The archdeacon seems to assume that, because I do not mention various works of Davidson's, this indicates that I have not read them. This is not the case. I would not claim to have read every word that he wrote; but I did spend considerable time in the British Museum and elsewhere, reading his charges, sermons, introductions to books, etc. Of course there is much to be said about Davidson that could not be said in a single article of less than four thousand words, and I was bound, therefore, to select such passages as would illustrate the theme which I was anxious to present. The archdeacon makes much of an uncompleted quotation from the Charge of 1912, but in so doing he shows that he is confusing ends with means. The rest of the sentence, which he quotes in his letter, makes no difference to what Davidson declared to be the "chief purpose and aim" of the Church's work, and I had already quoted (on p. 272) words very similar to those which the archdeacon quotes here. Moreover, the fact that the archbishop was on friendly terms with his fellow-bishops, that he quoted from the Caroline divines and Dr Pusey, and that some elderly clergymen in 1891 declared that they found his addresses inspiring, all seems to me irrelevant.

To any independent historian, looking back on the recent history of the Church, there can be no doubt that, during the first quarter of this century, the Anglican Church in this country lost a great deal of ground. The question is bound to be asked sooner or later: "What sort of leadership was the Church getting during those critical years?" or, more specifically, "Was Randall Davidson qualified to give the right sort of lead?" It is, as I said in my article, too early as yet to answer these questions; but, after a fairly close study of his charges, letters and other printed works, one is left in considerable doubt.

Yours, etc.,

JOHN R. H. MOORMAN.

THE THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE,
CHICHESTER.

"THEOLOGICAL VERBOSITY"

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

In your August issue you published a letter from Dr Mascall in which he calculated the number of words in Dr Karl Barth's *Church Dogmatics*. Dr Mascall expects that, at the rate of half a million words per half-volume, the whole work will contain about four million words.

I am afraid that Dr Mascall still underestimates the probable total, because (*a*) so far, two volumes have been published in half-volumes, but Volume III even in three sub-volumes; (*b*) there is not only Volume IV to come but—as Karl Barth would put it—"sub conditione Jacobea" (St James 4. 15)—even a Volume V, each of which may have two or more sub-volumes.

I do not feel competent to argue with Dr Mascall about the economic consequences of buying these volumes, nor about the eschatological aspect of having read them (according to Dr Mascall to have read this work would be a gravamen in the eyes of the eternal Judge on the Dies irae). I can only confess that I find it both useful and stimulating to read these volumes, and if this is "sin", well, then—probably owing to my Lutheran past—I do take comfort from Luther's exhortation: "Pecca fortiter, crede fortius." Just to do the latter, I find these volumes extremely helpful.

These millions of words by which Dr Barth expounds the Word of God have, I venture to suggest, no other function but that of John the Baptist's cry, "He must increase," bearing witness to the counterpart of the same saying, too (St John 3. 30). I expect that Dr Barth himself would be quite willing to cut out ephemeral parts of his work (e.g. excursus on contemporary philosophers such as Heidegger, Sartre, etc.), once these philosophers' obscuring the view has come to an end. But, alas, we have not all yet struggled clear of these impediments in which Dr Mascall himself may never have been entangled.

May I conclude with a request based on the old Roman principle of "Audietur et altera pars" and offer my own translation of an excerpt from Karl Barth's Preface to Volume II/2 of his *Church Dogmatics*?

"Naturally, there has been a lot of comment on the length of this work and of its different parts. I admit: the Bible knows how to say things more briefly. However, I do not find myself, nor any of my contemporaries whom I know, able to expound what has been said much more briefly in the Bible without considering it very closely: this, necessarily, takes up time and space, but fulfils what is required for a system of Church Dogmatics that truly serves its proper purpose. More patience than that which I have to demand of myself is, after all, not required from those who wish to be my readers. May I quote the following historical reminiscence to my readers' as well as to my own comfort? When Schleiermacher was about to put the finishing touch to the first edition of his *Doctrine of Faith*, he wrote

in a letter to his friend Twesten (7 September 1822): 'Whenever I look at my book, I heave a sigh about its great length.' I know that my *Dogmatics* already exceeds greatly the length of Schleiermacher's *Doctrine of Faith*. Nevertheless, I would like to see my work credited with Twesten's reply (9 March 1923) to Schleiermacher's apology: 'Do not take to heart the great length of your book which you deplore. The majority will find its length indispensable for their understanding, and the minority who, may be, could do with less for fully understanding you, will certainly accept gratefully any explanation you are willing to offer.' Yes, indeed, it all needs such a lot of explanations if you want to understand and to expound it properly! Who knows whether, in some important places, I have not been—just to the contrary—too brief?"

Quot capita, tot sensus.

Yours sincerely,
M. F. Cordes.

6 *August* 1956.

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

When you live a retired country life you like to keep abreast of the latest developments in ways of thinking. For this reason I am grateful to Dr Mascall for his admirably thought-out letter about Karl Barth's *Dogmatics*. I feel that I have been introduced to new paths in logic; and in particular I enjoyed the following argument:

"(1) Barth's *Dogmatics* is a work of very great length.

(2) I have not read Barth's *Dogmatics*. (Indeed, I know so little about the matter that I am ignorant of the number of its volumes.)

(3) Therefore, I adjudge it could, without detriment to its quality, be abridged to one-third of its length."

Yours faithfully,
T. H. L. Parker.

Little Ponton,
Lincs.

"A LITERARY NOTE"

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

Mr Sisson's note, interesting as it was, failed to give the assistance one hoped to find for the writing of modern prayers. Moreover, he left one reader wondering what he meant by rhythm. To equate "those old *rhythms*" with "a miserable ecclesiastic *dialect*" did not seem to make sense.

As long ago as 1912 Mr John Shelly published in the *Church Quarterly Review* an article on the influence of the Latin *cursus* on the Prayer Book collects. The next year a lecture by A. C. Clark entitled *Prose Rhythm in English* was published by the Clarendon

Press. This carried the matter further, since Clark, in discussing Saintsbury's *History of English Prose Rhythm*, pin-pointed some characteristic English rhythms in the Prayer Book and elsewhere which, while pleasing to our ears would have been tabooed in Latin. Rhythm, as used by these writers, is to be identified neither with dialect nor vocabulary, but with those arrangements of accents and stresses which satisfy the ear. Personally I think the Leonine collect for St Stephen to which Mr Sisson takes exception might be improved by omitting "holy" before "martyrs" and "even" before "for his persecutors", and by adding "Saint" between "Deacon" and "Stephen." But I don't think Mr Sisson's objections lie there. What, also, does he mean by the "common tradition" to which modern prayers must be tied? Does he merely mean that we should use the conversational style of ordinary daily life? I am sure Cranmer did not talk at the dinner-table in the style of the Exhortation to Morning and Evening Prayer. The quotation from the *Bidding the Bedes* is hardly to the point: its parallel is rather to giving out notices than to addressing the Almighty.

It is surprising how few of the additional prayers supplied in 1928 can be used with any satisfaction. In the effort to be modern they fail to be musical, and have only succeeded in becoming dated.

Yours truly,

MAURICE FROST.

DEDDINGTON VICARAGE,
OXFORD.
30 *July* 1956.

Mr Sisson writes:

It does not surprise me that Mr Frost did not find in my article assistance "for the writing of modern prayers", and I should be sorry to think of anyone turning to a literary note for that. What I said was that "no one can say" how the prayers I desiderated could be written. My point was that, when they were, they might well arise out of the same inter-action between the common speech of the day and the Latin of the collects as produced Cranmer's book. They would not be "modern" or "antique"; they would simply be newly minted.

I think, with Mr Frost, that Cranmer's language was generally well adapted to the occasion, and that when he asked someone to pass the salt he did not do so in terms which made them think he was about to exhort them to join in a general confession. I don't see that my use of the word "dialect" need cause any confusion: dialects have rhythms, or my ears deceive me. *Bidding the Bedes* is not the bedes themselves, but Mr Frost's parallel with giving out the notices is surely as wide of the mark on the other side.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

Mr C. H. Sisson's "Literary Note" in your issue for August makes me wish that someone would put the Book of Common Prayer

into modern English. Cranmer needs a J. B. Phillips as much as the translators of the "Authorized" Version do.

Yours faithfully,
JOHN LAWRENCE.

24 ST LEONARD'S TERRACE,
LONDON, S.W.3.

TOLERATION

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Canon Baker's article in the August THEOLOGY left me, I am sorry to say, in a state of mind far from the Tolerance which he upheld before us and wished, I imagine, to inculcate in us. But then, was Canon Baker tolerant himself in his article?

Billy Graham, for instance. I hold no brief for the evangelist, and indeed as far as my own parish is concerned I have found very little practical and permanent good done, after visitation of those commended to me from the campaign. (The experience, I am told, of many others.) But before passing judgment upon him and his work I felt it incumbent upon me to go to hear him, which I did. (I hope Canon Baker did the same.) I came away impressed by two characteristics, Graham's sincerity and his humility. I did not notice whether he was tolerant, but I have the feeling that sincerity and humility are as important as any other qualities in the service of the Kingdom, perhaps more than most.

Canon Baker makes three references to Billy Graham (pp. 316 and 317), each of them critical. The specific criticism in each case may well be justified; I do not know. But it would be difficult to find better examples of the Intolerance the article sets out to decry.

"The Synoptic Jesus", Canon Baker says, "was terrifyingly tolerant." But was he? Loving, considerate, merciful, yes, but when any matter of principle is at stake, clear, emphatic, uncompromising. Not intolerant perhaps, but equally not always tolerant.

As to the putative refusal of St Francis to use such a phrase as "whited sepulchres", was it not St Francis who put a curse upon Peter of Stacia because he broke the rule of the order by building a house for it, and refused, when pressed to do so, to remove the curse? Would this be termed toleration?

Now I fear I may also have become intolerant, but please may we not spoil one of the greatest stories in the world by reducing it to a question of a "son's stomach" and a "father's hug"?

Yours, etc.
FRANCIS T. LAMBERT.

ST LUKE'S VICARAGE,
WEST NORWOOD.

A CHINESE FOOTNOTE

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

May we add a Chinese footnote to Canon Sansbury's article on liturgical revision in the Anglican Communion?

The Bishop of Chekiang told us when he was in England in July that a new Prayer Book for the whole of the Chung Hua Sheng Kung Hui, which will replace the eight diocesan Prayer Books now in use, will be published probably at the end of the year. The existing books are more or less literal translations of 1662 (with in some cases matter from 1928) or of the American or Canadian books. The new book will not be experimental or adventurous liturgically but will simply unify the existing varying translations and minor differences. It is apparently undecided whether they will continue to print the 1662 Consecration Prayer in parallel with the longer American Consecration Prayer (as has been the practice for some decades in many of the existing books) or opt for one or the other. It is probable that the two terms commonly in use for "God"—*T'ien chu* used by the Roman Catholic Church and in certain of the Anglican books, and *Shang Ti* used by the Protestants and in others of the Anglican books—will be retained and used together, somewhat in the same way as are "priest" and "minister" in 1662. The third term for "God"—*Shen*—which is used mainly by fundamentalist Christians is not to be used. Bishop Ting has been asked to make arrangements for copies of the book when completed to be available in London.

He explained that this was a conservative revision. There are Chinese (notably Bishop Shen Tze-kao) who hope for a more adventurous and Chinese revision. This is not excluded, in the future. But it is felt in China that a more radical revision must wait upon and come out of a deeper shared experience of corporate worship.

In view of the relation of liturgical revision to the theological understanding of the Church, it may be relevant to add that Bishop Ting also said in reply to questions: (1) there is a deeper sense of fellowship and a greater measure of co-operation between a wider range of non-Roman Churches than in the past; (2) there is no movement for organic unity between particular Churches at present; (3) there are no formal relations with the Roman Catholic Church but some informal ones (for example, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Nanking speaks from time to time to the students of the interdenominational Nanking Theological Seminary); (4) the small Chinese Orthodox Church, founded by Russian Orthodox, has expressed a desire for closer relations with the Chung Hua Sheng Kung Hui.

Yours faithfully,
G. FRANCIS S. GRAY.
DAVID M. PATON.

LONDON.

WAS LUTHER A NOMINALIST?

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

The interesting remarks concerning the relation between Lutheran and Occamist doctrine of redemption in Mr Morris's letter very well agree really—as it seems to me—with the thoughts that I presented in my article. That St Paul (and Holy Scripture as a whole) should be mentioned and referred to in the first place, when the theology of Luther is to be clarified, I would of course immediately acknowledge. If the name of St Paul does not appear in my article, it is only because I limited my short account to the question of Occamist influences without any claim to expound the development of Luther's theological thinking or to define the other sources of his theology.

I find it important to stress that the doctrine of St Paul was to Luther not merely a complement to some Occamist thoughts or the solution of some stresses in that system. Those two sources were in his sight incommensurable.

Yours faithfully,
BENGT HÄGGLUND.

THE UNIVERSITY OF LUND,
SWEDEN.

THE WEST INDIES

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

I have read with interest the Archbishop of the West Indies' "Letter" in the June THEOLOGY just received. One sentence in it is, I think, likely to give a wrong impression. His Grace refers to "our Theological College at Codrington where local men are trained for the ministry". This college in fact is, and always has been, open to men from outside the Province and (according to the College magazine) of the present twenty-five students, six come from England and one from Gambia. I am sure that it is not the intention of the authorities that the student-body should become exclusively West Indian. Rather is it desirable that the partnership between locally born clergymen and those from outside, which will long be necessary in ministering to this Province, should be strengthened by some of them having been trained together—though, of course, it is not sufficient to gather our English staff only by ordination.

If, after more than sixteen years in the Province, I may make a suggestion it is that English layfolk might well consider settling in the West Indies after retirement. I have particularly in mind those who retire with pension, perhaps as early as at fifty-five, and yet do not like to feel themselves "on the shelf". There is ample scope here for all kinds of useful voluntary work, for which, it may be, the "Welfare State" gives less opportunity at home. Speaking of the places I

know personally, I believe that one of our great weaknesses is the lack of capable and reliable people to undertake responsible lay work. Moreover, there is need to show decent Christian family life in a part of the world where it is still all too little in evidence.

Yours faithfully,
F. Bertram Jones.

St James's Rectory,
Layou,
St Vincent, B.W.I.
17 *July* 1956.

BOOK REVIEWS

Religion and the Christian Faith. By Hendrik Kraemer. Lutterworth Press. 45s.

It is not too much to say that Dr Kraemer's *The Christian Message in a Non-Christian World*, published in 1938, inaugurated an epoch in the missionary enterprise, and that a whole generation of those engaged in it has been in some measure schooled by his approach, though not without controversy with the schoolmaster. This new volume, which may well be regarded as a sequel to the former one, is of the same calibre. It is clear that the author has added to his insights into the nature of the non-Christian faiths during his directorship of the Ecumenical Institute at Bossey and his recent tours of Asia.

He now approaches the question of the relation between the Christian faith and other religions, not in the first place from the standpoint of evangelistic encounter, as in *The Christian Message in a Non-Christian World*, though there is a chapter pointing the relevance of his conclusions to this subject, but by a detailed analysis and criticism of positions widely adopted in the comparative study of religion and the philosophy of religion. This line of study becomes most exciting in the last chapter of all, an epilogue to the theme of the book as a whole, in which the author crosses swords with Tillich on the question of the possibility of "reconciliation" between ontological philosophy and Biblical theology, as a test of the validity of his own contentions. In the earlier chapters the reader is conducted seriatim through the works of Otto, Wach, Troeltsch, Jung, Jaspers and finally Radhakrishnan in the context of an exposition of Hinduism. One wonders why the author should be surprised at Rhadhakrishnan's hostility to Christianity. Indeed, he has himself at a later point indicated the answer. For a reformed Hinduism that would impose on all the schools of India a common worship, in which the Beatitudes and the Lord's Prayer can be chanted alongside purple passages from the *Vedas* the *Q'ran*, the undiminished Christian claim is the ultimate embarrassment and source of irritation. Whether we go all the way with him or not, Dr Kraemer has provided a salutary exposure of muddled thinking at this point.

There is also a briefer survey of Christian theological approaches to the subject from Justin Martyr to the present day, leading up to the author's definition of his own position. The conclusion to which he comes is that there is no such thing as "religion" in the singular; but there is a universal religious consciousness which is essentially underivable. The significance of this is surely much greater than he is prepared to admit. Over against "the religions"—and Christianity or the Church as a concrete historical entity may be classed in this category—he sets the unparalleled divine self-disclosure of the Biblical revelation, making clear at several points that he stands where he stood in 1938. The book, while it opens up a certain amount of new ground in the debate which the author started eighteen years ago and in effect sums it up, shows no tendency to depart from the position taken then.

One point at which we must join issue is concerning the dichotomy which is assumed to exist between the divine Word and the historic Church. The Church, to be sure, is fallible; but does not the doctrine of the Incarnation demand complementary belief in an "in-historization" of the Word in the world through the Church? This word, coined by Farmer, is ugly, but penetrating, and the reader would do well to balance this book with a perusal of Farmer's Gifford Lectures.

References to the Holy Spirit are as few as references to the Church, and it is perhaps significant that, in the twenty-six pages devoted to the Epistle to the Romans, 8. 1–17 and 12 are not among the passages expounded. The Prologue of St John's Gospel only finds a place in the Biblical section of the book in order to demonstrate that there is no support in it for the notion of a *praeparatio evangelica*. In consequence there is little, if any, recognition of non-Christian religious movements (e.g. the resurgent religions of Asia) as spheres in which God may be operating and speaking to the world, even if they are not submitting to his control. Is this the crucial limitation in Dr Kraemer's outlook?

Hinduism, among the non-Christian faiths, is alone selected for a detailed and not unsympathetic study. Whether the author will escape the usual Hindu rejoinder that, as a Westerner, he has not understood the Hindu mind, remains to be seen. It would have added to clarity if some of the many Sanskrit terms used had been more fully explained. In other parts of the book the number of quotations from the German might well have been pruned, particularly where the English translation seems adequately to give their meaning.

T. S. Garrett.

Tirumaraiyur,
South India.

Christian Theology and Natural Science By E. L. Mascall. Longmans. 25s.

Dr Mascall has set out "to open up a field of discourse between theologians and scientists which has for too long had its gates locked

on both sides", and he wishes to show "by discussing a certain number of matters in which both theology and science have an interest, that it is possible to be an orthodox Christian without either ignoring or repudiating the discoveries and theories of present-day science". What exists is possible, and Dr Mascall is himself a brilliant instance of an orthodox Christian who shows a wide knowledge of and deep respect for the discoveries of science. He passes in review modern physics and cosmology, brain physiology, and evolutionary biology, giving in each case a brief but illuminating account of their present state, and picking out those aspects which seem to bear upon theology.

All this is placed against the background of a description of the nature of scientific theories which would now be accepted by most philosophers of science, namely that they are models, some of whose properties correspond to the observable world, but which are not themselves necessarily literal descriptions of the world. Dr Mascall points out that this change in the view of what a scientific theory is, has important negative consequences for theology, because it means that no scientific theory can now be put forward as a metaphysic, and therefore there can be no head-on collisions between science and theology such as those occasioned by the scientific materialism of the last century. A new occasion for conflict has arisen, however, from this very development, for in denying that science provides literal and final descriptions of the world, most philosophers would now deny that any other intellectual discipline can do so either, and would question the whole of transcendental theology on the grounds that it claims to make the kind of metaphysical assertions which science has abandoned, without giving a clear account of how these assertions are to be understood. Dr Mascall has not done full justice to this problem, which is the main point now at issue between philosophers of science and theologians, but it is perhaps unfair to suggest that he should have written a different kind of book, especially as he has expounded his own view of the metaphysical foundation of theology elsewhere.

As for the problems in which he finds common ground between science and theology, it is remarkable in how many cases his conclusion is that whatever may in the end be regarded as the most satisfactory scientific answer, no fundamental difference is made to the assertions of theology. He argues, for instance, that the cosmological models involving continuous creation have no implications one way or the other for the theological assertion that God created and sustains the world; and that there is no Christian interest in maintaining a rigid distinction between living and non-living matter, and no need for dismay if such a distinction is shown to be scientifically untenable.

These conclusions are perhaps unexciting, but I believe them to be sound. I am less happy, however, when Dr Mascall comes to deal with the sciences of man. Here he follows the Thomist tradition in identifying the human soul with the rational faculty or mind, although emphasizing, again with St Thomas, that man is to be re-

garded as a psycho-physical unity and not as a soul temporarily inhabiting an inessential body. He goes on to point out that the unity of body and mind postulated in modern physiology is entirely consistent with this traditional Christian view. But it is not clear how far Dr Mascall wishes to carry the comparison of "body and mind" in physiology, and "body and soul" in theology. In some places he seems to identify "mind" with "soul", for he speaks of the soul governing the body in a context where one would normally speak of the mind, and argues that that in man which differentiates him, biologically speaking, from the animals, is that which "in its own right" survives the death of the body. This means that he has to accept a special creation of individual souls, outside the evolutionary process, thus admitting the kind of discontinuity which he has rejected in the case of the emergence of life.

It would seem much more consonant with the New Testament understanding of man, and incidentally more consistent with the conclusions elsewhere in the book, to admit that the whole of human personality is subject to the natural processes of the creation. Man's reason is as much a product of these as his body, equally subject to death and equally in need of redemption. Dr Mascall is on much stronger ground when he ascribes the uniqueness of man to the fact that God has taken man's nature upon himself in Christ, for surely it is here that we should look for the definition of man's place in the creation, and not to the possession of an extra-natural "soul". I hope I have not misunderstood Dr Mascall here, and there is no space to argue the point adequately. One could wish that Protestant theologians would follow Dr Mascall's excellent example, and come down into the arena of science and religion more often, for there does seem to be a need for clarification of contemporary Protestant doctrines of man as against the view put forward in this book, which seems to a reviewer trained in science and not in theology to be at once inconsistent with the Biblical undertsanding of man, and most difficult to harmonize with the spirit of biological science.

Mary B. Hesse.

University College,
London.

From Becket to Langton: English Church Government, 1170–1213. By C. R. Cheney. Manchester University Press. 18s.

For his theme as Ford Lecturer at Oxford in 1955, Professor Cheney chose to investigate the development of government and administration in the Ecclesia Anglicana during the half-century between the death of Becket and the primacy of Langton. By reason of the *cause célèbre* of the murder of Becket and its consequences on the one hand, and the concurrence of Langton's primacy with the pontificate of Innocent III on the other hand, the intervening period has been neglected, if not dismissed, as a comparatively unimportant interlude. Professor Cheney is convinced that this is not the case; and in a series of informative and interesting chapters he assembles the

evidence for the steady, if unobtrusive, growth of the internal administration of the Church of England.

Such a study must necessarily give chief attention to the episcopate, though the paucity of records of episcopal administration in this period limits the possibility of a thorough reconstruction of the pattern of diocesan administration. But the antecedents of the bench suggest a considerable experience of and ability in administration; for of 43 bishops 20 had served in the royal civil service, 27 had been archdeacons, and 17 combined the duties of bishop and royal judge. It is to be expected therefore that, though "bishops were not being appointed for academic attainments", yet "such records as remain give the impression of sober men of affairs who had high standards of efficiency". Unfortunately almost nothing is known of the application of these standards to the properly episcopal duties of ordination, confirmation and dedication of churches. But the previous training of many bishops in the royal administration led them to pay proper deference to the royal wishes as well as a due ecclesiastical obedience to Rome. Apart from the spectacular humiliation of the king after the murder of Becket, the papacy was laying unspectacular foundations for the exercise of its *plenitudo potestatis* in relation to the English Church; particularly in the matters of papal expectatives and provisions, the growth of appeals to Rome and the vexed conflict concerning suits about advowsons. Despite the incipient nationalism which Professor Cheney traces both in England and in the increasingly Italianized Curia, most bishops avoided a direct collision by seeking compromise solutions, a natural and serviceable expedient in a period of calm between the storms of Becket and of Langton.

The administrative efforts of the episcopate were directed mainly to the better organization of their dioceses therefore; as was seen by the development of the functions of the archdeacon, the rural dean, and the official. In the undeclared war against clerical marriage and the quasi-hereditary succession of benefices, real, if only gradual, progress was achieved. "In the thirteenth century hereditary succession appears as an occasional abuse, no longer as a deeply rooted social habit. The critical time of change was the generation after Becket." Both socially and educationally, however, the secular clergy differed little from their parishioners. Celibacy was a remote ideal, nor were there signs as yet even "of elementary examinations in the reading and understanding of the liturgy when clerks were ordained or presented to livings". Furthermore, the economic position of the clergy may be sufficiently gauged from the fact that "as late as 1222 the minimum salary for vicars was fixed at only 5 marks".

It is in relation to the status of vicars indeed that Professor Cheney makes an important modification of accepted opinion. The general impression hitherto has been that the perpetual vicar and the ordination of vicarages were a product of the 13th century. Both in his text and in a more detailed appendix, Professor Cheney argues for an earlier development of this practice; so that "the decree of the Fourth Lateran Council did not create a new system, though it

stimulated bishops to extend the system and to augment existing vicarages". One effect of these developments, cumulatively considered, was to widen the gulf between clergy and laity; so that the latter sank to a more passive role in the church. The half-century surveyed by Professor Cheney therefore "impressed the pattern of diocesan government on the Church", and made effective the principle "that the clerical order should manage its own affairs". These Ford Lectures are a lucid, succinct and informative account of the progress of this administrative evolution.

Norman Sykes.

Cambridge.

Evangelische Marienverehrung. Zeitschrift fuer Oekumenische Eingeit herausgegeben von Friedrich Heiler und Fr Siegmund-Schultze, 1955–6, Heft I. Ernst Reinhardt Verlag. Munich. Preis DM. 4.50 (Subscriptionspreis DM. 3.85).

The Handmaid of the Lord. By Adrienne von Speyr. Translated by Alexander Dru. Harvill Press. 16s.

"Protestant Reverence for Mary" may render the German title of this symposium. Those who can read it will find it worth acquiring. Its 96 pages teem with interest and information.

Friedrich Heiler, the editor, contributes five or six articles, ranging from dogmatic description to homiletic simplicity. He shows what Luther thought of the Blessed Virgin by a typical quotation: "I will be very glad to have her pray for me, but I will not make her my comfort and life!" He points out that the Presentation and Annunciation were originally, and are primarily, Festivals of Christ. Unlike us, the Lutherans retained all the Marian festivals proper, including her Birth, Visitation, and even Assumption (Himmelfahrt)! He expresses disapproval of Calvin's slightly nasty negativity. We have also some charming sermons for Marian festivals and a memorial address for Joachim Wach, a former pupil who went to Chicago and became an Episcopalian, in which Heiler expresses his Anglican sympathies. In a note on a book by four German Lutheran divines recently converted to Romanism, he surprises us by telling them that one of these was helped to make his decision by "the papal dispensation by which married Protestant clergy can become Roman priests while continuing in their marriage".

Paula Schaefer, dealing with the Anglican attitude, shows a remarkable understanding of the various shades in the chameleonic kaleidoscope of our "comprehensiveness". She very fitly sums up by a quotation in English from a letter from the "devout and cultured . . . widow of a high prelate of the English State-Church" who says: "It is very plain that we do reverence her very greatly, though without anything approaching 'invocation'. I feel myself, in my own mind, that she must dislike excessive devotion to herself apart from her son." We can only venture on two small observations. As far as we know, the use of the 1549 Prayer Book was not officially per-

mitted in 1928! And V. Bennett and R. Winch were still Roman Catholics when they published their protest against the papal definition of the Assumption.

Other sides are also represented. Jacob Amstutz (Bern) writes from the point of view of liberal Protestantism. Erasmus' lovely "Greeting to the Virgin Mother" is printed on the first page. Paul Schorlemmer describes the role of the B.V.M. in Dante's Divine Comedy. It is in line with other medieval mariology. She is a mediatrix by intercession, yet her activity is essentially Christ-centred. Yet when Piccarda in the Paradiso uses the Ave it is as praise and not as a request for intercession. (We are reminded how the Ave came into use at the beginning of the 12th century, and at first consisted only of the words of the angel and of Elizabeth. The word "Jesus" was added later. The concluding phrase was never used by our forefathers or by Dante, since it was not added till the 17th century!) This medieval mariology goes beyond and often contradicts Scripture and the Fathers. Yet it is associated with much literary and artistic beauty and social chivalry towards womanhood. It has in all its wild exuberance the naturalness and the beauty of an unpruned rose tree. Calvinistic iconoclasts may want to cut it at the root, but many Anglicans and Lutherans will say, "Destroy it not for a blessing is in it", however much they may insist that it needs to be pruned and trained. But the speculative-systematic type of mariology now widely prevalent in the Roman Church is more like an arrangement of wires garnished with wax flowers and paper leaves! Heiler calls it "Mythological Rationalism". Dr Oscar Schroeder in a long and important article tells us about the discussion that is now going on in the Roman Church as to the place of the Blessed Virgin. He says it has had no parallel since that about Modernism forty or fifty years ago. He deals first with the new practice of the "peregrinatio", by which some celebrated statue comes to visit her votaries instead of their going on pilgrimage to it; or two statues may even come to meet each other! He also speaks of the new vogue for "consecrating" peoples to the Virgin (observing that it necessarily must mean either too little or too much!). He also tells of the mariological conferences in Rome in 1950 and 1954 and subsequent discussions in the Press. It is the Spanish dogmaticians who go to the wildest extremes, making Mary the "principle of grace for us", and putting her outside the "Adamite order of grace". Many clergy and laity, especially in Germany, dislike such developments. We are told that the generality of German theologians in recent years have shown a significant silence in regard to the officially sponsored thesis of the "Mediatorship of Mary". Dr Schroeder wishes they would speak out. He speaks out himself. So does Dr Pinsk of Berlin, whom he often quotes, and so do a surprising number of others.

We should not omit to mention a review by Albrecht Volkmann of the last edition of Bicknell on the 39 Articles (Longmans, 1955). He expresses his appreciation. But he protests against an instance of the English habit of ignorant misrepresentation of Luther, who is taken to task by Bicknell for saying what he never said—that we

are justified "*Propter* fidem". He actually said, "gratis justificentur *propter Christum per* fidem".

Adrienne Speyer's *Handmaid of the Lord* is reverently written, lucidly translated, and beautifully produced. But, alas, it is a work of fiction, and takes us into air we cannot breathe!

Gospel texts are used as mottoes or springboards for a dive into strange depths of speculation that are neither controlled by the letter nor inspired by the spirit of the New Testament. We are told, for instance, that "On Easter morning she was all expectation. . . . And the Lord her Son stood before her in the glory of God, filling her expectation with a fulness beyond the grasp of human sense". And this in spite of the fact that the Gospels contain no record of any Resurrection appearance to the Blessed Virgin!

Cosslett Quin.

St John's, Cork.

Psychology and Worship. By R. S. Lee. S.C.M. Press. 7s. 6d.

The Burroughs Memorial Lectures in the University of Leeds come topically to hand when the centenary of the birth of Sigmund Freud has occasioned renewed appraisal of the remarkable contribution of his genius to our understanding of human mental function. For their author—the incumbent of the University Church at Oxford—approaches his obviously important subject as a pronounced Freudian and it is interesting to contemplate the outcome of this specific position, remembering Freud's own extreme religious scepticism. Dr Edward Glover, in a special centenary article in *The Times* recently observed, a trifle patronizingly: "the range of Freud's psychology includes . . . such behaviouristic end-products of mental activity as language, literature, art, philosophy and religion. . . . [It] was and is essentially anthropocentric." What then does Dr Lee make of the particular "behaviouristic end-product" he has chosen to discuss? To a considerable extent, precisely that. It is somewhat as if the psyche were an intangible kind of epicyclic gearbox with the Oedipus Complex as layshaft and oiled by our multigrade unconscious lubricity which maintains its viscosity over the whole range of practical working temperatures. This familiar picture has long ceased to provoke, of course. It has merely come to seem inadequate nowadays—especially as, in order to maintain the driving character of the Oedipus situation, the author has had to abandon consideration of the psychological development of women in relation to worship.

Worship is derived from the animal instincts, he contends, being "the final mode of integration to the environment". Its direction arises from the invariable situation that at the age of three the son comes into conflict with the father, "driven by an almost unbearable desire to possess his mother and enjoy her sensually", having earlier wished to incorporate her into himself by swallowing. He will later desire to devour his father also, impelled by primal unconscious urges emanating from the (hypothetical) primitive circumstance in

which the horde father, compelling "the other males to abstain from his women" by brute force, must eventually be killed and eaten by them in order to relieve the "enforced abstention and inhibition of their sexual desires" which have "worked to establish a brotherhood among the males who remained in the horde". "We cannot shut our eyes to the fact that these universal and very strong impulses find expression in the Christian sacrament of Holy Communion."

Evident, no doubt, to the thoroughgoing Freudian, these dogmas are apt to strike the rest of us as unduly constricting. The limitations of his manhood also presumably kept the full significance of what he was doing from Jesus himself.

The price that ultimately has to be paid "to escape castration at the hands of the father" is the substitution of "aim-inhibited love", i.e. tender affection (*sic*), for the child's sensual aims towards his mother, and the formation of the super-ego (more or less equated in these lectures with conscience) from the unconscious memory of guilt and sin against the father. From these experiences the child procures his ideas about God, who is inevitably identified with the Oedipus image of the father. The conception of God springs from the three elements: super-ego, ego-ideal and infantile father-image. But its adult form eventually becomes accommodated to the demands of the ego and the reality principle. So the steeple on the church, instead of seeming a phallic symbol, may come to signify the aspiration of the spirit after God; while the cross become symbolic of our Lord's crucifixion instead of being the focus of unconscious masochistic desires. At length in maturer religion, Love, which rises from the id (the primitive natural self) must take the place of Law (issuing from the super-ego) as the guiding principle of our lives. "To conclude, the essential meaning of religion is not to know God, as one knows a friend; it is to become God . . . and it is only in becoming Him that we know Him." The significance of the Holy Communion is that by means of it "we do not merely imitate his external example, we become Christ". Surely this is dangerously akin to heresy even in these free-thinking days?

One suspects at the beginning of the book that the Freudian system, illuminating as it is in many directions, will prove a Procrustean bed into which to fit Christian worship with all its rich implications, and so it transpires; though, slipping from time to time outside its range, Dr Lee makes a number of valuable observations in the course of his lectures. Where other schools of psychology, and especially the researches of Jung, have so much to offer towards the deeper understanding of this cardinal matter, it seems curiously categorical to confine such an investigation within a pattern of thought so essentially unsympathetic. Another "behaviouristic end-product of mental activity" brings to mind Mary Webb's groping old women muttering "Accorns for the pig, faggots for the fire; but we missed summat".

John H. L. Waterson.

Stoke D'Abernon.

SHORTER NOTICES

THE FOUR GREAT HERESIES. By J. W. C. Wand. Mowbrays. 8s. 6d.

SAINT AUGUSTINE ET L'AUGUSTINISME. By Henri Marrou. Editions du Seuil. N.p.

The Diocese of London has been fortunate in that for the last ten years its Bishop has taken his pastoral office to include making known in a clear and popular manner certain necessary, if not vital, aspects of the Christian faith more usually left to the textbooks.

Dr Wand sensed rightly that the intelligent layman as well as the parish priest ought to know more of the primitive Church to which our own tradition has at times made so forcible an appeal. *The Four Great Heresies* is the culmination of his Lent Lectures. With one exception, all have dealt with the same early period. May we hope, since his connexion with his diocese is to continue, that these will be by no means the last of them?

However, since they have been put into print for a wider public, I feel it would have been useful to have appended a list of books for further reading, with some short comment on each; and also possibly one or two examples in translation of the early Creeds that featured in the story so lucidly told, especially of the difficulties involved in starting with terminology ambiguously understood or made to carry too much on its foundations. It was not only a question of whether to insert an "i" into *homoousios*, as Gibbon alleged, but also of guessing, as it must often have been, whether the speaker in conciliar controversy said or meant *genetos* or *gennetos*. The Christian Church did not start with a *definition* of God *tabula rasa*; but for the Councils it might have taken it for granted.

M. Marrou's little work is set out on rather different lines, divided into three, the first part on St Augustine himself, the third on his influence in the Western Church, interlarded in the middle with well-chosen extracts in French translation from his writings; the whole beautifully and lavishly illustrated and annotated as somehow only the French know how. Designed for French consumption, I suppose one ought not to be surprised that more space is given to Jansenism than to Luther, who gets a bare mention with Calvin.

All said and done, M. Marrou is a first-rate scholar of the period, and he has done his work well. The text, bibliography, etc., and the illustrations match equally in the care taken to produce a work of popularization of a very high standard.

C. STM. B. MACFARLANE.

LAPLEY.

EPICURUS AND HIS GODS. By A. J. Festugière, O.P., translated by C. W. Chilton. Basil Blackwell. 9s. 6d.

This is a welcome translation of Fr Festugière's *Epicure et ses dieux*, first published in 1946, but now revised with alterations and additions by the author. The book is a model of conciseness, par-

ticularly the preface, where Fr Festugière gives a brilliant sketch of the social and economic conditions which led the Hellenistic sages, of whatever school, to pursue an ideal of serene indifference, *ataraxia*, to the troubles of this world. Epicurus' own life and character are sympathetically described, his study of physical science not for its own sake but only in order to refute the popular belief in Hades and divine providence, his exaltation of friendship as the highest form of happiness, not as for Plato merely a means leading to the contemplation of the ideal. Epicureanism itself is seen as a form of religion, since Epicurus held that by participating in religious festivals the worshipper could to some extent share in the supreme *ataraxia* of the gods. Finally, Epicureanism is contrasted with the "astral religion" of Plato and the Stoics, whereby a mystic, instead of relegating the gods to a blissful indifference, could find support in the omnipotence and omniscience of an eternal and active God.

The non-specialist will find this a very readable book, while for the scholar there are notes with extensive quotations and discussion of critical points of text and exegesis, also a useful bibliography.

M. Whittaker.

University of Nottingham.

Witchcraft in Central Africa and Europe. By J. T. Munday. United Society for Christian Literature. 3s. 6d.

There is a spate of books written on the background of Africa. A large proportion is written by those who have only a very superficial knowledge of the continent and its peoples. *Witchcraft in Central Africa and Europe* is not one of these fleeting impressions. The author has spent the best part of a lifetime in Africa, and he writes with an intimate knowledge of at least one African tribe.

Mr Munday has made a wide study of the literature on magic and witchcraft, and he has come to the conclusion that in some form or other they are an almost universal belief of the human race. He gives a brief survey of the history of magic in Western Europe, and he follows this up with a short original study of magic among the Lala tribe of Northern Rhodesia. In both Europe and Africa the intention of many of those who deal in magic is good and beneficial, though the fear which surrounds "black" magic has brought its "white" counterpart under suspicion. Many of the so-called witch doctors are, in fact, herbalists. This study will be of particular value to those who are interested in the new society which is emerging in Africa—a society which, in spite of its veneer of sophistication, still retains strong beliefs in the power of all kinds of magic.

It is to be hoped that Mr Munday's study of this subject will encourage others who are engaged in work among the African people to pass on to their fellow-workers some of the fruits of their experience. The publishers are to be congratulated on producing this book at so low a price, and it is to be hoped that their enterprise will encourage many to read it.

† Robert Pretoria.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: H. D. Lewis (Ed.), *Contemporary British Philosophy*, Third Series (35s.); G. V. Jones, *Christology and Myth in the New Testament* (21s.).

APPEAL COMMITTEE FOR WOMEN'S WORK IN THE C.S.I.: Sister Carol Graham, *The Church of South India: a further stage in development* [3rd edition] (2s.).

A.P.R.: *The Vision, incorporating the General List of Retreats* (1s.).

BEREAN PRESS: William Robinson, *Peace in Heaven and on Earth* (4s. 6d.).

A. AND C. BLACK: H. St. J. Hart (Ed.), *S. T. Coleridge: Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit* (8s. 6d.); H. E. Root (Ed.), *David Hume: The Natural History of Religion* (6s. 6d.); Henry Chadwick (Ed.), *Lessing's Theological Writings* (8s. 6d.).

BLACKFRIARS: *The Priest of the People* (4s. 6d.).

BURNS AND OATES: A. A. Stephenson, S.J., *Anglican Orders* (7s. 6d.).

CHURCH INFORMATION BOARD: *The National Church and the Social Order* (5s. 6d.).

CLARENDON PRESS: Christopher R. North, *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah* [revised and enlarged edition: reviewed in THEOLOGY, March 1950, pp. 107 ff., by Professor N. W. Porteous, who described it as "a treatise on the problem of the Servant such as has never been surpassed for comprehensiveness and thoroughness"] (25s.); R. H. Lightfoot, *St John's Gospel* (30s.).

JAMES CLARKE AND CO.: John Frederick Jansen, *Calvin's Doctrine on the Work of Christ* (8s. 6d.).

COLLINS: John Farrow, *The Story of Thomas More* (18s.); Austin Farrer (Ed.), *A Short Bible* (2s. 6d.).

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS (London: Cumberlege): Manford George Gutzke, *John Dewey's Thought and its Implications for Christian Education* (32s.).

CONFRATERNITY OF UNITY (11 SANDRINGHAM CLOSE, ENFIELD): Donald Rea, *The Church of South India and the Church* (5s., post free).

EDINBURGH HOUSE PRESS: Olive Wyon, *Prayers for Unity through the Christian Year* (1s. 6d.); W. Easton, *West Indies—What of the Church?* (1s. 6d.).

EPWORTH PRESS: J. Alexander Findlay, *The Fourth Gospel* (12s. 6d.).

GOLLANCZ: Edmond Cherbonnier, *Hardness of Heart* (12s. 6d.); Daniel T. Jenkins, *The Strangeness of the Church* (12s. 6d.).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: E. Stanley Jones, *Mastery—The Art of Mastering Life* (10s. 6d); Rudolf Steiner, *The Redemption of Thinking* (12s. 6d.).

INDEPENDENT PRESS: Carl A. Glover, *Messages from the Parables* (8s. 6d.); H. F. Lovell Cocks, *The Hope of Glory* [Drew Lecture on Immortality] (1s. 6d.).

IONA COMMUNITY: George F. MacLeod, *Only One Way Left* (10s. 6d.).

ARTHUR JAMES: Elsie H. Salmon, *Christ still Healing* (10s. 6d.).

LONGMANS: Francis Clark, S.J., *Anglican Orders and Defect of Intention* (25s.); Lynn J. Radcliffe, *Making Prayer Real* (18s. 6d.); Mark Pontifex, O.S.B. (Ed.), *St Augustine—The Problem of Free Choice* (25s.); Bernard Leeming, S.J., *Principles of Sacramental Theology* (30s.); Evelyn Underhill, *The Fruits of the Spirit—Light of Christ—Abba* (9s. 6d.); Paul A. Welsby, *A Modern Catechism* (2s. 6d.).

MACMILLAN: W. David Stacey, *The Pauline View of Man* (25s.); John B. Noss, *Man's Religions* (41s. 6d.).

NAUWELAERTS (LOUVAIN): J. Gonsette, S.J., *Pierre Damien et la Culture Profane* (60 Belgian frs).

OLIVER AND BOYD: T. F. Torrance, *Kingdom and Church* (16s.).

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PRESS: C. J. Stranks, *The Travels and Letters of St Paul* (2s.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LTD.
GUILDFORD AND LONDON

THE CHURCHMAN'S POCKET BOOK

the ideal diary for any Church member

is now available

contains the Calendar with table of lessons from the *New Lectionary* ★ all the Anglican dioceses and bishops ★ the Houses of Convocation ★ Church Societies etc.

No. 1 **5s. 9d. including Purchase Tax**

No. 3 **7s. including Purchase Tax**
Leather

PUBLISHED WITH CHARLES LETTS LTD. BY S·P·C·K

HENDRIK KRAEMER

RELIGION AND THE CHRISTIAN FAITH

One of the great intellects of European Christianity today publishes his long-awaited and profound discussion on the relation of Christianity with other religions. 45s. net

LUTTERWORTH PRESS

ENGLISH AND WELSH CRUCIFIXES, 670-1550

J. Eric Hunt **25s. net**

Mr Hunt's account of the development of the representation of the Crucifixion is illustrated by 39 photographs of historic and important crucifixes. The general reader, no less than the art historian, will find interest and enjoyment in joining his pilgrimage to the places where these ancient monuments have fortunately been preserved.

Ready 26 October

PAST FINDING OUT

The tragic story of Joanna Southcott and her Successors

G. R. Balleine **15s. 6d. net**

The story of Joanna Southcott and the Movement she began is entertaining. It is also more than that; it is instructive. The social historian, the minister of religion, the psychic researcher—all have something to learn from the circumstances, the simple faith and intellectual oddities, and the experiences of precognition and clair-audience of Joanna Southcott. The facts are fantastic; but facts they are. Mr Balleine records them with the historian's objectivity and the skill of the writer.

Ready 12 October

CURRENT PROBLEMS OF THE CHURCH

A. E. J. Rawlinson **5s. net**

The problems discussed in this book are all vitally important for the future of religion in this country, and indeed throughout Christendom: the "Ecumenical Encounter"; Episcopacy and the Anglican Tradition; the relation of Confirmation to Baptism in the general process of Christian initiation; Divorce and Marriage Discipline. There is also a useful list of recommended books on these subjects.

Ready 26 October

THE NEW TESTAMENT BACKGROUND: SELECTED DOCUMENTS

C. K. Barrett **25s. net**

A selection of documents, in translation and with notes, throwing light on the background against which the events of the New Testament took place.